

1  
2  
3  
4

5 IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
6 FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

7  
8 VECTREN COMMUNICATIONS SERVICES, No. C 08-3137 SI  
INC.,

9 **ORDER RE: DISCOVERY**

10 v.  
11 Plaintiff,  
12 CITY OF ALAMEDA,  
13 Defendant.

/

14 This order resolves several discovery disputes pending before the Court.

15  
16 **I. Documents relating to the operating results of other municipal telecom systems** (Docket  
Nos. 88, 93, 95 & 99)

17 The City has moved to compel plaintiff Vectren Communications Services (“VCS”) to produce  
18 documents relating to the operating results of other municipal telecom systems. In an order filed April  
19 16, 2009, the Court denied a similar motion to compel filed by the City, but left open the possibility that  
20 there might later be a “specific showing of relevance” to justify the City’s document requests. The City  
21 contends that discovery conducted since the April 2009 order shows that information about operating  
22 results of other municipal telecom systems is relevant. The Court agrees that the City has now made  
23 a sufficient showing of relevance to support the document requests.

24 However, VCS states that based upon a recent comprehensive search of reasonably available  
25 hard copy documents and electronic data, VCS believes that it does not have documents relating to the  
26 operating results of other telecom systems. VCS states that if it does have any such documents, they  
27 would be located in one or more of 250 boxes stored in an offsite facility and would pre-date February  
28

1 2002, several years before the relevant time period. Vectren estimates that it would take between 500  
2 to 700 hours to review the contents of these boxes. The City suggests that VCS may in fact possess  
3 responsive documents, but has not provided any reason to question the representations made by VCS.  
4 VCS has described with specificity the search it conducted for responsive documents, and the Court is  
5 satisfied with VCS's representation that it does not have responsive documents except as outlined. The  
6 Court also finds that the burden associated with searching the off-site location cannot be justified by the  
7 remote possibility that there may be responsive documents from prior to 2002 in the offsite boxes.  
8 Accordingly, the Court DENIES defendant's motion to compel. (Docket No. 88).

9

10 **II. Deloitte & Touche auditing documents (Docket Nos. 104 & 106)**

11 The second dispute concerns the production of auditing documents from third party Vectren  
12 Corporation's accounting firm, Deloitte & Touche. According to papers submitted by plaintiff VCS and  
13 Deloitte & Touche, Vectren Corporation, which is headquartered in Indiana and the parent of VCS,  
14 engaged Deloitte & Touche's Indiana office to perform annual audits and quarterly reviews of Vectren  
15 Corporation's financial statements. As part of this work, Deloitte & Touche has audited and reviewed  
16 the \$6.3 million installment obligation owed by the City to VCS. In July 2009, the City served a  
17 subpoena on Deloitte & Touche in Indiana seeking all documents related to the audit, and in August  
18 2009 the City served a subpoena on Deloitte & Touche's San Francisco office seeking the same  
19 documents, as well as a deposition of the person most knowledgeable about the documents. The City  
20 also served VCS with document requests seeking similar accounting records. Both VCS and Deloitte  
21 & Touche have invoked an Indiana accountant-client privilege and refused to produce the requested  
22 documents.

23 The resolution of this dispute turns on whether California or Indiana law applies regarding the  
24 existence of the privilege. In a diversity case such as this, state privilege law applies. *See* Federal Rule  
25 of Evidence 501. The parties agree that California does not recognize an accountant-client privilege,  
26 *Platypus Wear, Inc. v. K.D. Company, Inc.*, 905 F. Supp. 808, 812 (S.D. Cal. 1995), but that the  
27 privilege exists in Indiana. *See* Indiana Code 25-2.1-14-1. The City contends that California law  
28 governs because this is a diversity case in California, and the parties' contracts (the Installment Sale

1 Agreement and the Intercreditor Agreement) specify that California law applies. VCS argues the  
2 parties' choice of law in those contracts is irrelevant because Vectren Corporation and Deloitte &  
3 Touche are not parties to those contracts. The Court agrees with plaintiff that the parties' choice of  
4 California law in the contracts does not bind nonparties Vectren Corporation and Deloitte & Touche.

5 "In a diversity case, federal courts apply the substantive law of the forum in which the court is  
6 located, including the forum's choice of law rules." *Downing v. Abercrombie & Fitch*, 265 F.3d 994,  
7 1005 (9th Cir. 2001) (internal quotations omitted). The Ninth Circuit has instructed,

8 California applies a three-step "governmental interest" analysis to choice-of-law  
9 questions: (1) "the court examines the substantive laws of each jurisdiction to determine  
10 whether the laws differ as applied to the relevant transaction", (2) "if the laws do differ,  
11 the court must determine whether a true conflict[ ] exists in that each of the relevant  
jurisdictions has an interest in having its law applied", and (3) "if more than one  
jurisdiction has a legitimate interest . . . the court [must] identify and apply the law of  
the state whose interest would be more impaired if its law were not applied."

12 *Id.* at 1005 (quoting *Abogados v. AT & T, Inc.*, 223 F.3d 932, 934 (9th Cir. 2000)). Here, as noted  
13 above, Indiana and California law differ as to the existence of an accountant-client privilege. As the  
14 location of the forum of this case, and because California law governs the parties' claims, California  
15 has an interest in the application of its law. Indiana also has a legitimate interest in this matter because,  
16 according to Vectren Corporation and Deloitte & Touche, the auditing work was performed primarily  
17 in Indiana<sup>1</sup> for a nonparty Indiana resident, and the documents sought are housed in Indiana. The Court  
18 finds that under these circumstances, the interest analysis weighs in favor of Indiana law because "the  
19 parties who made the communications expected that those communications would remain confidential  
20 under the law of that jurisdiction, and the state has an interest in furthering the policies behind the  
21 privilege at issue." *Lego Stratos Lightwave, Inc.*, 224 F.R.D. 576, 579 (S.D.N.Y. 2004) (applying New  
22 York choice of law rules and applying Illinois accounting privilege where accountant and client resided  
23 in Illinois and communications occurred in Illinois). Moreover, the Court finds it significant that  
24 plaintiff has already produced to the City all documents provided by VCS and Vectren Corporation to  
25 Deloitte regarding the Alameda obligation, and thus the only documents responsive to the subpoena that  
26 are outstanding are Deloitte's internal work papers. Plaintiff has also produced VCS's internal analysis

---

27  
28 <sup>1</sup> Plaintiff states that it "understands" that Deloitte's engagement team members were drawn  
primarily from Deloitte's Indiana and Illinois offices.

1 as to any potential impairment or lack thereof regarding the Alameda obligation.

2       The Court is also not persuaded by the City's argument that any privilege under Indiana law has  
3 been waived by the failure to produce a privilege log. Although a privilege log is normally required,  
4 the Court agrees with plaintiff and Deloitte & Touche that it would have been unduly burdensome and  
5 unnecessary to create a privilege log when the asserted privilege broadly protects the documents at issue  
6 from disclosure. Accordingly, the Court DENIES defendant's motion to compel. (Docket No. 104).

7

8

9       **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

10  
11 Dated: October 20, 2009

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
SUSAN ILLSTON  
United States District Judge

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28